

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Sprint Docket No. 2006)**

In the Application of:)	
)	
Haldar et al.)	Art Unit: 2614
)	
Serial No.: 10/602,389)	Examiner: Smith, Creighton H.
)	
Filed: June 24, 2003)	Confirmation No. 1561
)	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR)	
CHANGING A SERVICE)	
ACCOUNT PROFILE FROM)	
A STATION OPERATED)	
UNDER ANOTHER SERVICE)	
ACCOUNT)	

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner's allowance of the present application. Applicants agree that the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the entirety of each combination of steps and/or structure recited by each of the allowed claims.

In allowing the claims, however, the Examiner seems to have paraphrased certain claim elements, stating that the “prior art fails to disclose applicant's method of changing a first account profile from a subscriber operating under a second subscriber account by submitting the

feature code as dialed digits, and then changing the subscriber's first account service profile." Applicants do not acquiesce to this characterization the claimed invention.

The claims allowed by the Examiner generally involve account service profiles for *subscriber accounts* and *subscriber stations* operating under *subscriber accounts*. For example, claim 6 involves a subscriber station operating under a second subscriber account, and also involves making a change to a first subscriber account.

It appears that the Examiner, in paraphrasing elements of the claims, unintentionally substituted the term "subscriber" for the terms "subscriber station" and "subscriber account." The allowed independent claims, such as claim 6, do not require a subscriber to the first or second subscriber account to be any particular subscriber - the first and second subscriber account may be associated with the same subscriber, or with different subscribers. Similarly, the claims do not limit use of a subscriber station to any particular subscriber. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner's Statement does not change the scope of the invention as previously disclosed in the specification and prosecution history.

More generally, while Applicants believe that the claims are allowable, Applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in any particular claim, that each feature is required for patentability, or that patentability resides in any particular feature not recited in Applicants' claims.


Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date:

6/29/07

By:



Michael D. Clifford
Reg. No. 60,550